Ham-Policy Digest   Sun, 9 Oct 94   Volume 94 : Issue 483

Today's Topics:
                       Appliance operators?
              ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE
           Code debate solved on national show? (2 msgs)
                    CW QSO Content (Re: Get O
                 CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)
                         Get Over It
                    IGNORE THIS IS A TEST
             Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

Date: Sat, 8 Oct 1994 19:35:03 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Appliance operators?

jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

> What the fu** are you talking about? Have the sperm fumes in your
> rest rooms on campus addled your brains completely?

Ah yes, more words of wisdom from Angus. Perhaps you should:

> Take some valiums. And while you're in a more relaxed state, call the
> local help lines and make an appointment for some counselling. You seem
> to be in serious need of it.

> And fix you reply to header. Even Steve Dipirro figured out how to fix it,
> so a handy person such as yourself should manage to get it right eventually.

I imagine you meant to say ``And fix your reply-to in the header.''
Okay, if it bother's you so much I'll start adding Reply-To: up
there since the computer center won't fix the default address;
but why would that concern you so much? Last time I tried
to take this spat to email you never showed up; you apparently need
an audience.

Remember, watch your blood pressure, buddy!

73 from the Central Pacific,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sat, 8 Oct 1994 22:01:27 -0400 (EDT)
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access4.digex.net>
Subject: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Fellow ARRL Members,

The following questions have been formulated through a review of concerns
expressed in QST and other publications as well suggestions from
rec.radio.amateur.policy participants. These are the specific questions
that were distributed to the three candidates for Roanoke Division
Director and the two candidates for Vice Director. I realize that there
are many more issues that could (and maybe should) have been addressed,
but I wanted to keep the number of questions at around twenty. I think
that the candidates' answers will give the ARRL members voting in the
election a fairly good idea of the candidate's general perspective and how
he may stand on the various issues that are likely to be encountered
during their terms.

The candidates were advised:

"Your answers will be distributed as widely as possible before the
election in an effort to better inform those voting in the Division's
Director and Vice Director election. Please respond as soon as possible.
A postage paid envelope is provided for your convenience. If you choose
to not participate, please return the questionnaire in the provided
postage paid envelope."

The questionnaires were mailed on the morning of October 8, 1994 from
Arlington, Virginia. The results will be posted here as soon as they are
all received. Look for the post around 10/15/94.

73,

Tony Stalls, K4KYO
ARRL Life Member

ARRL CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____
Call Sign: _____
Year first licensed: _____
License Class
ARRL Life Member? Yes [ ] No [ ]
QCWA Member? Yes [ ] No [ ] Life Member? Yes [ ] No [ ]
Other Organizations:
Please indicate how your on-air activity is apportioned.

Below 30 MHz _____ %

BREAKDOWN BY MODE
     CW [ ] FM [ ] AM [ ] SSB [ ] Digital/Packet [ ]
     Video [ ] Other Activity (LIST PLEASE) [ ]

Above 30 MHz _____ %

BREAKDOWN BY MODE [%]:
     CW [ ] FM [ ] AM [ ] SSB [ ] Video [ ]
     Digital/Packet [ ] Satellite [ ] R/C [ ]
     Other Activity (LIST PLEASE) [ ]

 1. In the order of their importance, list the top three things you
     hope to accomplish if elected.

****
PLEASE NOTE:

  THE REMAINING 19 QUESTIONS ASKED FOR A RESPONSE AS TO THE CANDIDATE'S
  DEGREE OF AGREEMENT RANGING FROM "TOTALLY AGREE" (A) TO "TOTALLY
  DISAGREE" (G).

  THE CHOICES WERE AS FOLLOWS:
                              TOTALLY AGREE .... (A)
                              STRONGLY AGREE .... (B)
                              SOMEWHAT AGREE .... (C)
                              NO OPINION .... (D)
                              SOMEWHAT DISAGREE .... (E)
                              STRONGLY DISAGREE .... (F)

```
                        TOTALLY DISAGREE ........... (G)


*************************************************************************

  2.   There is no conflict of interest between the publication of QST
       as a competitive entity in the commercial marketplace and the
       ARRL's not for profit purposes as an IRS 501(c)(3) tax exempt
       educational and charitable organization.

  3.   The League's methods for sampling membership opinion in
       determining policy are statistically valid.

  4.   Within the past five years, League policy has accurately
       reflected the majority perspective of the amateur radio
       community.

  5.   Based on the relatively low number of votes cast in ARRL
       elections and responses to surveys, most "members" have little
       interest in the League, but instead are just subscribers to QST.

  6.   Complaints of too much secrecy and behind-the-scenes dealing
       with regard to ARRL policy matters are valid.

  7.   The ARRL should expend significantly more effort in dealing
       with RFI problems.

  8.   Antenna restrictions are becoming an increasingly serious problem
       and the ARRL should devote more resources toward combating them.

  9.   The Federal Communications Commission has been responsive to the
       needs of the radio community.

 10.   The Federal Communications Commission as a whole does not like
       dealing with the amateur radio community.

 11.   Amateur bands above 400 MHz are in significantly more danger of
       being lost to other services than those below.

 12.   Digital sub-bands should be set aside in the amateur HF spectrum.

 13.   Incentive Licensing was a good idea and has accomplished its
       purposes in spite of the fact that many long-term General Class
       licensees were deprived of previously held privileges.

 14.   The no-code Technician license is responsible for the virtual
       demise of the Novice Class license.

 15.   No-code Technician Class licensing is accomplishing the purposes
```

used to justify it's adoption.

16. The International Morse Code is obsolete and should be eliminated
     as a requirement for amateur radio licensing.

17. Amateur radio examinations are significantly easier than they
     were before the VEC program came into existence.

18. The VEC program has been accomplishing it's intended purposes and
     should be continued in it's present form even though there has
     been recent evidence of fraud.

19. Releasing question pools of verbatim questions and answers does
     not adversely effect the validity of testing process.

20. The General Class code speed requirement should be reduced to the
     pre-1936 level of 10 words per minute to give greater access to
     the HF bands, increase activity, and help preserve the spectrum
     space for amateur radio.

[%]:

Date: 8 Oct 1994 18:06:30 GMT
From: Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com
Subject: Code debate solved on national show?

In article <kevin.jessup.11.00109888@mail.mei.com> kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com
(Kevin Jessup) writes:
>In article <lenwink.242.0014ED58@indirect.com> lenwink@indirect.com (Len Winkler)
writes:
>
>>On Sunday, October 23, 1994, at 6:00pm EST, The Ham Radio & More
>>show will feature the "Rational Code Debate". (yea sure) Guesting will be
>>Internet's own Dana Meyers against the code being required, and Paul

```
>>Flaherty for it.
>
>"Shake hands gentlemen.  I want this to be a clean fight!"  :-))

Hey, this might not be a _fair_ fight! One might expect a pro-coder to
have a better fist. How's your fist, Dana?
--
73, Cecil, KG7BK, OOTC   (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

------------------------------


Date: Sun, 9 Oct 1994 02:41:23 GMT
From: jjmartin@world.std.com (James J Martin)
Subject: Code debate solved on national show?

Dana Myers (myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM) wrote:
[whole bunch of snippety snips for brevity and reduced bandwidth]

: The point is, if r.r.a.p. is to be a decent forum for useful
: discussion, we need to be reasonable.  Off-topic flame wars,
: personal attacks, they dilute the point of this newsgroup.

Point very well made.  :)

73 de Jim / WK1V

        I support search and rescue....   I keep getting lost.

------------------------------


Date: 9 Oct 94 01:54:54 GMT
From: William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM
Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get O

>I think that I'll wait 'till I can get a "CA6??" call before I send in a
>request for a new call!  (g)  I wonder if I'll still be here when or if
>it gets around to the CA6s...
> __...  ...__    N6ZVZ


moving to canada, are we...?  US is only W, K, N and AA to AL...it's going to
be a pretty long wait for a CA6.. license issued by the FCC....8)

73, bill

------------------------------


Date: 8 Oct 1994 00:09:41 GMT
```

From: mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)
Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

In <371emo$se3@chnews.intel.com> jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ)
writes:

>   OBLIGATORY REC.RADIO.AMATEUR.POLICY DECLARATION
>
>namely, that forcing everyone to take this route to an amateur
>radio operator's license is coercion.
>
Please be more careful throwing around this word with regard to voluntary
activities. When the men with guns come by and "request" that you get a ham
license, then we can talk about coercion.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 8 Oct 1994 19:16:35 GMT
From: mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)
Subject: Get Over It

In <100594022159Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>
>dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (David Tiller) writes:
>
>>I'm in exactly the same boat!!! I hear them inverted dit for dah, and
>>forward for back all at the same time!!! I'm still plugging away, though!
>>I wonder what the heck it's called, if this "condition" has a name yet?
>>Strange....
>
>"Human"

Dan, is this an admission that you are attempting to de-humanize all those who
listen in on your code-practice net?>
>
>(I suppose I need to include a smilely for the humor challenged... ;-)
>
Ditto (I think....)

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Sun, 9 Oct 1994 02:43:30 GMT
From: jjmartin@world.std.com (James J Martin)

Subject: IGNORE THIS IS A TEST

Bruce Micales (bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu) wrote:

: Please ignore this post

Okay....

Date: Sat, 8 Oct 1994 19:18:47 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

>In article <Cwtu73.Gs8@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu writes:
>
> > I'm shocked that anyone would admit this. You're transmitting a
> > signal over the air and you're not *monitoring* the frequency
> > nor your signal?
>
> > This stinks of very bad operating habits.
>
> > This really stinks.

> Can you say agreed upon bandplans?
> For example....

What on earth do bandplans have to do with not monitoring the
frequency your using?

> No one that I know (especially those trying to link with others on an
> automated forwarding basis) will even consider operating packet or amtor
> in the region below 14.075 MHz. I'm sorry gentlemen, but if you insist
> on trying to operate a CW QSO underneath an established forwarding channel
> you have no one to complain to and nothing to complain about.

My comments concerned the digitalis moving below the QRP calling
frequency on 40M. I guess you saw the 4 and mistook it for 14 MHz.

> The more I read your commentary on stuff Jeff, the more I'm convinced that
> you should really seek psychiatric help. There are a number of programs
> available on a ability to pay basis especialy to faculty staff members.

Wow, Angus - I'm glad you analyse my posts so carefully! I hardly pay

any attention to your's. You must sit in front of your terminal day
and night trying to think up nasty remarks - you should really try
to spend your time more wisely - maybe go back to school so that
you can learn how to spell `you':

> Ya know,

Are you one of those Californians that say `ya know' in every sentence?

> just for the record, based on your comments about stepping on
> others who you might not be able to hear, it sounds like you shouldn't
> even key up if you're running more than a watt. Since obviously you might
> be able to transmit farther than you can hear. Of course, with some of
> the gear you've cobbled up out of old TV sets, that probabbly isn't a
> problem.

True - I never run more than 1W of power - using 2N2222A's in the finals
of my xmtrs. It helps being in KH6 land.

Oh, congratulations - you're the first person to ever be placed in
a postmaster's kill file! Remember, watch you blood pressure, buddy.

73 from Beautiful Hawaii,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sun, 9 Oct 1994 00:23:30 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<555_9409250500@ssalpha.com> <1994Sep29.162714.330@clark.dgim.doc.ca>,
<Cwynvq.Ezx@cruzio.com>
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu
Subject: Re: Get Over It

>
>It does seem a little *peculiar* to me to spend hour upon hour learning to
>tap out morse digital at 20wpm so I can exchange "Hi, I use a <<insert radio
>name here>> and a <<insert antenna name here>> and I am located at <<insert QTH
>here>> and am a <<insert license class here>> and my call is <<insert call

In article <Cwynvq.Ezx@cruzio.com> brettb@cruzio.com writes:

>Perhaps I'm *lazy* or merely uninspired, but I really would prefer to spend my
>limited time learning modern digital modes, both radio and landline, than CW.
>I would really love to learn more about VHF/UHF/Microwave though.

15 minutes per day isn't really too much to study to gain HF privileges.

You could do this during TV commercials. Or on your commute to work.
Or during your daily exercises. Or while reading Net News (is that the
new name for UseNet?).

But if you're interested in vhf/uhf/microwaves as you state no need
to even bother with the code.

Here's another quiz - in the following is Brett referring to HF CW?
HF SSB? 2M (or above) FM? Let's see:

>It does seem a little *peculiar* to me to spend hour upon hour
>learning... so I can exchange "Hi, I use a <<insert radio name here>>
>and a <<insert antenna name here>> and I am located at <<insert QTH
>here>> and am a <<insert license class here>> and my call is <<insert call
>here>> and so forth";"communications" that is restricted in terms of content to
>remarks of a "personnal or technical nature". Especially in the context of
>being able to use the Internet for world-wide communications with all the
>abilities of mail, chat, newsgroups, gopher, WWW and so forth with virtually no
>restrictions as to content.

Can't tell? Hmmmm. Why would Brett expect more content from HF CW
than from other modes? What is discussed via SSB and FM and Packet
is also discussed via CW - no more, no less.

Jeff NH6IL
(Just for Angus: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu
                    jherman@uhunix.uhcc.hawaii.edu
                jherman@hawaii.edu;   write soon!)

Date: Sat, 8 Oct 1994 19:46:35 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<100394174418Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> <36tdss$9b2@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<100694133520Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject: Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>>Dan said:

>>: That is not the point. The point is to have a pool ready when the
>>   ^^^ ^^^^^ ^^ ^^ ^^^^ ^ ^^^^ ^^^^^ ^^^^ ^^^
>>: situation arises, to provide any service that may be needed. If the ARS
>> ^^^^^^^^^^^ ^^^^^^ ^^ ^^^^^^^ ^^^ ^^^^^^ ^^^^^ ^^ ^^ ^^^^^^

```
>>: frequencies are sufficent (most of the time) then that is all tha is used.
>>: If those systems are not appropriate, then the 'operators' move to the
>>: areas that are (like WWII).

>>Ooooh, I love this line...sounds like a hearty endorsement for
>>requiring CW proficiency!  And from Dan, no less!  Thanks Dan! :-)

>For CW perhaps. As I say every week on my code practice net. But not for
>High Speed testing at the 13 and 20 WPM level given the situation today.
>There is little to no use for manual morse outside of the HF contesting
>(and some rag chewing) that goes on in the ARS. There is virtually no use
>for manual morse outside the ARS, there is extreamly limited use of manual
>morse in the types of communications going on IN the ARS. Therefore, the
>need for high speed manual morse testing is becomming (has become, IMO)
>outdated.

``Extremely limited use...in ARS''??? Are you implying CW is used very
little? Do you have an antenna attached to your receiver? I stand by my
`about 50% of HF comms are conducted via CW' statement (but I will
concede that due to my QTH here in the Pacific that figure *might* be
a bit lower on the Mainland US - a good portion of the QSO's I hear
are not only Mainland US but also from North, Central, and Southeast
Asia, and the South Pacific). Your comment is such a gross understate-
ment that it is false.

73 Dan!
Jeff

-----------------------------

Date: Sun, 9 Oct 1994 00:33:29 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<RFM.94Oct6092104@urth.eng.sun.com> <CxAH8D.Bnx@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<RFM.94Oct7100804@urth.eng.sun.com>
Subject: Re: Rich McAllister, Digital Scourge of the Airwaves

In article <RFM.94Oct7100804@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard
McAllister) writes:
>In article <CxAH8D.Bnx@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>
>>>Yes.  That's why I said "during the QSO".   It would be important to listen
>>>frequently between CQ's.
>>
>>But do you? You said you listen when you start up - does `start up'
>>mean at the beginning of each QSO, or when you initially turn on
>>the rig? You implied you keep the volume down after you `start up'.
```

```
>
>Tell you what, Jeff.  You tell me how often you think I should listen and I'll
>tell you if I have ever called CQ on a digital mode longer than that
>between listening.

After a digital-only subband is created (excluding CW) then you can
remove the speaker from your receive if you like; but until then good
operating practice dictates that you monitor the frequency you're
using.

73 from Expensive Hawaii,
Jeff NH6IL

------------------------------

Date: 8 Oct 1994 20:04:24 GMT
From: myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers)

References<lenwink.242.0014ED58@indirect.com>
<kevin.jessup.11.00109888@mail.mei.com>, <376n36$f1u@chnews.intel.com>
Subject: Re: Code debate solved on national show?

In article <376n36$f1u@chnews.intel.com> Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>In article <kevin.jessup.11.00109888@mail.mei.com> kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com
(Kevin Jessup) writes:
>>In article <lenwink.242.0014ED58@indirect.com> lenwink@indirect.com (Len
Winkler) writes:
>>
>>>On Sunday, October 23, 1994, at 6:00pm EST, The Ham Radio & More
>>>show will feature the "Rational Code Debate". (yea sure) Guesting will be
>>>Internet's own Dana Meyers against the code being required, and Paul
>>>Flaherty for it.
>>
>>"Shake hands gentlemen.  I want this to be a clean fight!"  :-))
>
>Hey, this might not be a _fair_ fight! One might expect a pro-coder to
>have a better fist. How's your fist, Dana?

For sending code or for punching people?  Given I don't often punch
people, I really don't know how my fist is in that use.

However, my fist on the air, sending Morse code, isn't too bad, at
least as long as the Curtis 8044 in my keyer cooperates.  I don't
get too much HF time these days, but the little bit I do get I'm
usually using CW.

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j  | Views expressed here are
```

```
   *
 * (310) 348-6043       | mine and do not necessarily    *
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com  | reflect those of my employer
    *
 * "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"                   *
```

Date: 8 Oct 1994 19:00:10 -0500
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<lenwink.242.0014ED58@indirect.com>
<kevin.jessup.11.00109888@mail.mei.com>, <376n36$f1u@chnews.intel.com>
Subject: Re: Code debate solved on national show?

In article <376n36$f1u@chnews.intel.com>,
 <Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com> wrote:
>In article <kevin.jessup.11.00109888@mail.mei.com> kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com
(Kevin Jessup) writes:
>>In article <lenwink.242.0014ED58@indirect.com> lenwink@indirect.com (Len
Winkler) writes:
>>
>>>On Sunday, October 23, 1994, at 6:00pm EST, The Ham Radio & More
>>>show will feature the "Rational Code Debate". (yea sure) Guesting will be
>>>Internet's own Dana Meyers against the code being required, and Paul
>>>Flaherty for it.
>>
>>"Shake hands gentlemen. I want this to be a clean fight!" :-))
>
>Hey, this might not be a _fair_ fight! One might expect a pro-coder to
>have a better fist. How's your fist, Dana?

<yawn>

--
"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

Date: Sun, 9 Oct 1994 07:04:48 GMT
From: dbasinge@nickel.ucs.indiana.edu (Mike Basinger)

References<lenwink.242.0014ED58@indirect.com>
<kevin.jessup.11.00109888@mail.mei.com>, <lenwink.244.001481BA@indirect.com>
Subject: Re: Code debate solved on national show?

I can not receive Ham Radio & More radio show where I'm located. Would
someone mind taping the show with the code/no-code debate and mail it

to me. I will cover postage.

thanks,
mike
--
D. Michael Basinger [call sign pending]
dbasinge@nickel.ucs.indiana.edu
dbasinge@nations.ucs.indiana.edu (NeXT Mail)
"Not speaking for Indiana University"

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #483
****